

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
MAG REGIONAL COUNCIL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
February 16, 2010
MAG Offices, Cholla Room
302 N. 1st Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Councilwoman Peggy Neely, Chair
#Mayor Thomas L. Schoaf, Litchfield Park,
Vice Chair
#Mayor Hugh Hallman, Tempe, Treasurer

Mayor Marie Lopez Rogers, Avondale
Mayor James M. Cavanaugh, Goodyear
Mayor Scott Smith, Mesa
#Mayor Jim Lane, Scottsdale

* Not present

Participated by video or telephone conference call

1. Call to Order

The Executive Committee meeting was called to order by Chair Peggy Neely at 12:05 p.m. She stated that the following items were at the table, for agenda item #4, a packet that includes a memorandum describing SB 1416 and the Memorandum of Understanding; and for agenda item #7, a cost list of different venues for the Desert Peaks awards. Chair Neely stated that public comment cards were available for those members of the public who wish to comment. Transit tickets were available from Valley Metro for those using transit to come to the meeting. Parking validation was available from MAG staff for those who parked in the parking garage.

2. Call to the Audience

Chair Neely noted that, according to the MAG public comment process, members of the audience who wish to speak are requested to fill out the public comment cards. She stated that there is a three-minute time limit. Public comment is provided at the beginning of the meeting for items that are not on the agenda that are within the jurisdiction of MAG, or non-action agenda items that are on the agenda for discussion or information only. Chair Neely noted that no public comment cards had been received.

3. Consent Agenda

Chair Neely noted that prior to action on the consent agenda, members of the audience are provided an opportunity to comment on consent items that are being presented for action. Following the comment period, Committee members may request that an item be removed from the consent agenda. There were no public comment cards received.

Chair Neely requested a motion to approve the consent agenda. Mayor Cavanaugh requested one minor change to the January 19th, 2010 minutes. He noted that on page five, second paragraph, the word “prescribes” should be changed to “proscribes.” Mayor Cavanaugh moved to approve items #3A through #3D. Mayor Smith seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

3A. Approval of the January 19, 2010, Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

The Regional Council Executive Committee, by consent, approved the January 19, 2010, Executive Committee meeting minutes.

3B. On-Call Transportation Planning Consultant Services Program

The Regional Council Executive Committee, by consent, approved amendment to the FY 2010 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget for \$150,000 to provide for an On-Call Transportation Planning Consultant Services program. MAG presently uses On-Call Services Contracts to supplement staff capabilities with expertise in specialized areas of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), Safety, and Transportation Modeling to expedite delivery of key programs in the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). As transportation planning demands continue to expand at MAG, a new On-Call Services Contract is sought for general transportation planning applications. The purpose of an On-Call Consultant Services list is for expediting the delivery of consultant services at MAG. For this proposed On-Call Transportation Planning Consultant Services program, MAG will select qualified consultants to assist staff in the following five service areas: Civil Engineering, Transportation Planning, Transportation Operations, Policy and Finance, and Public Involvement. An amendment is needed to the FY 2010 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget to include \$150,000 for an On-Call Transportation Planning Consultant Services program. On February 10, 2010, the Management Committee recommended amending the FY 2010 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget for \$150,000 to provide for an On-Call Transportation Planning Consultant Services program agenda.

3C. Status Update on the June 30, 2009 Single Audit and Management Letter Comments, MAG's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) and OMB Circular A-133 Reports (i.e., "Single Audit") for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2009

The Regional Council Executive Committee, by consent, approved recommending acceptance of the audit opinion issued on the MAG Comprehensive Annual Financial Report and Single Audit Report for the year ended June 30, 2009. The public accounting firm of LarsonAllen, LLP, has completed the audit of MAG's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) and Single Audit for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2009. An unqualified audit opinion was issued on January 29, 2010, on the financial statements of governmental activities, the discretely presented component units, each major fund and the aggregate remaining fund information. The independent auditors' report on compliance with the requirements applicable to major federal award programs, expressed an unqualified opinion on the Single Audit. The Single Audit report indicated there was a significant deficiency in MAG's internal control over financial reporting considered to be a material weakness that was corrected prior to the issuance of the statements. There were no instances of noncompliance considered to be material and no questioned costs. The Single Audit report had no repeat findings. No new or repeat Management Letter comments were issued for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2009. On February 10, 2010, the Management Committee recommended acceptance of the audit opinion issued on the MAG Comprehensive Annual Financial Report and Single Audit Report for the year ended June 30, 2009.

3D. Alternative/Social Media Policy and Employee User Agreement

The Regional Council Executive Committee, by consent, approved the recommendation of the Alternative/Social Media Policy and Employee User Agreement. During the January 19, 2010, meeting, MAG staff presented possibilities for using social media to supplement current communications and outreach. Social media Web sites like Facebook, Twitter and YouTube have the potential to increase public understanding of MAG and assist in the agency's goals and objectives. The Committee asked that staff develop a recommended social media policy based on additional research of current member agency practices, to ensure a secure and successful social media presence. MAG staff has drafted a social media policy and user agreement to begin launch of a social media program.

4. Status of the Transit Planning Agreement and Discussion of Potential Legislation

Dennis Smith, MAG Executive Director, stated that at the January 19th Executive Committee meeting, there was discussion about potential legislation and it was mentioned that bill folders were being opened. Mr. Smith explained since that time, SB1416 was introduced and there was confusion on the intent of the language in the bill. He noted that there were discussions with the Intergovernmental Representatives regarding concerns with the language in the bill. Mr. Smith explained Option #1 and that the transit planning responsibilities would be performed by MAG in cooperation with state and local transit operators. He also stated that the life cycle program developed by the RPTA would be in conformance with the MAG Regional Transportation Plan. Mr. Smith explained that RPTA requested that it be made clear in legislation that MAG would not be controlling the RPTA life cycle program, and MAG agreed. Mr. Smith also noted that MAG staff reviewed the bill and suggested that major changes to the RPTA life cycle program should be done by MAG in cooperation with transit operators because it could be changing the Regional Transportation Plan.

Mr. Smith explained that since that time, MAG received a re-write of SB1416 from RPTA, which is Option #2. He stated that the issue with RPTA's changes was that the language stated that RPTA would be doing the planning and recommending to MAG. RPTA stated that was not the intent. RPTA then produced another draft. Mr. Smith explained that this draft, Option #3, is a more comprehensive draft that includes, in the state statute, some of the corridor work and technology recommendations that are described in the MOU. Mr. Smith continued to explain the options. He stated that Option #4 was sent by RPTA and was suggested by the El Mirage attorney. He explained that the El Mirage attorney noted that RPTA is in the special district portion of the statute and that it was not appropriate to explain MAG's responsibilities in the special district part of the statute. It was suggested that there be a reference in the RPTA portion that the planning will be done by MAG, and then describe that in Article 28 were MAG's planning responsibility are explained.

Mr. Smith reviewed Option #5. He stated that there is a meeting scheduled later today with Kim Hildebrand from the Office of the Auditor General to review the final scope for the performance audit. The next step would be that the Office of the Auditor General would go out and advertise and hire a consultant. Mr. Smith stated that Option #5 would be not to run the bill but approve the MOU, and have the performance audit work on all the issues. Mr. Smith stated that in

conversations with the other agencies, it seems that everyone is in agreement on the MOU. Mr. Smith explained that final action on the MOU would be taken in March by the MAG board. He noted that this gives the other boards an opportunity to review the MOU. Mr. Smith continued that there have been some concerns on the MOU regarding local control. He explained that when an alternatives analysis is done, the goal is to determine a locally preferred alternative. The way that happens is that the agency would work with the effected city, the city would then bring the recommendation through their council for approval, followed by review by the agency board, and approval by MAG. Mr. Smith explained that the decision on a locally preferred alternative would always come through the MAG process because it would require amending the RTP. He noted that there was interest expressed that a locally preferred alternative be recommended for approval by the agency board. Mr. Smith explained that there are two thoughts on that issue. First, some think this process is better because you have the experts recommending approval and other say here we go again having the same cities on multiply boards recommending approval more than once.

Mr. Smith stated that MAG's recommendation would include two options: make minor changes to the bill and make sure MAG is not taking charge of any public transportation funds, and also indicate that if the RPTA or ADOT are making major changes to their life cycle program, those changes should be done by MAG in cooperation with the agency. Mr. Smith stated that the more structurally sound way to do this is Option #4, the El Mirage attorney's recommendation. He noted that this would get the language in the proper section of the statute.

Mayor Hallman stated that he wanted to make clear that the issue that he sees is not whether an item was being approved by the same agencies on multiple boards, but that the local authority remains to develop that locally preferred alternative by going through the city's council, and then through the MAG process. Chair Neely stated that she agrees with Mayor Hallman. Mr. Anderson explained that is exactly how MAG sees the process also. Mr. Anderson referenced the recent Mesa project. Mr. Smith suggested clarifying this in the MOU. Chair Neely asked if that would satisfy Mayor Hallman's concerns. Mayor Hallman stated that he believes that it should be clarified in the MOU and the statute. He stated that the concern would be that the statute governs over the MOU and if it is not corrected in the statute, it does not solve the problem. Mr. Smith stated that the changes will be made both in the MOU and statute. Chair Neely stated that she thought we would be further along with the MOU than we are today. She also suggested leaving the existing legislation out there, subject to having some bills changed. She noted that she is not comfortable choosing any one option without consulting with her staff. Chair Neely suggested scheduling a meeting to have a continued open dialogue on SB1416 and the MOU. Mayor Hallman stated that he agrees. He also mentioned that his staff has been working diligently with MAG staff and other parties. Mr. Smith suggested pulling together the respective agencies in a drafting session to get this done by the end of this week. He also noted that if the schedule of the Senate holds, this may require an amendment on Monday. Chair Neely stated that if that does not happen, then we go to Option #5 and let the auditors determine the outcome. She noted that she hopes that we can get this done so relying on the auditors does not happen.

Mayor Hallman stated he is not as concerned about having to fix the legislation as he was in the past. He stated that based on additional information received at the federal level. He explained

that his concern was more about making sure the process is clear and organized so it is efficient and effective.

Chair Neely asked staff if the other agencies are supportive of this process and do we believe that we have an MOU that the other boards will recommend approval. Mr. Smith stated that he believes that everyone is on board with the MOU. RPTA and VMR indicated they are on board. Mayor Hallman stated that he will have to look to his staff to make sure that the issue regarding local control is addressed in the MOU because he has not seen it. Mr. Smith stated that the locally preferred alternative language is not currently in the MOU, but will make sure that it is in the revised language. Mayor Smith asked about the impact of not getting bill language. Mr. Smith stated that at some point, someone will look at state statute and want to fix it to coordinate with what the MOU says. Mr. Anderson stated that the MOU represents an understanding among all the parties in terms of how we conduct business. He also explained that typically the auditors do not go back to state law. The auditors want to know what the paper trail is, how the decision processes are made and how well documented those processes are. Mr. Anderson stated that consistency relative to the plan goals and objective are important in terms of the process. He stated that his opinion is that whatever statutory changes are made are the right ones, and changes should be well thought out. He noted that there may be other things that come out of the performance audit that involve transit or other elements of Prop 400 that may also need statutory change.

Mayor Lane stated that one of the terms used regarding Option #4 was “structurally sound.” He asked for further clarification. Mr. Smith stated that from a drafting perspective, the attorney from El Mirage has it figured out. He noted that RPTA’s concern is how much of their planning responsibility will be taken away. He stated that this option suggests deleting planning language out of the RPTA section of the statutes and moving it to the MAG section of the law. This, however, causes some concern about what in statute would be left at RPTA, where there needs to be operational planning. Mr. Smith explained that operation planning and system level planning is the primary distinction. Mr. Smith stated that we need to work with RPTA and make sure that the operation planning the other agencies need to do is reflective in state statute. Mr. Smith stated that he believes that this can be done. Mr. Anderson noted that we need to be cognizant of the other transit planning agencies and how the state statute is structured. Mayor Hallman stated that he has greater comfort knowing we worked with other models, such as the Sacramento MOU. He stated that he agrees that we should get the MOU worked out before working on the state statute to avoid any unintended consequences.

Mayor Lopez-Rogers wanted to clarify the status and the goal of these documents. She stated that one question to address is are we working toward a regional transit authority, and what that means to each of the member agencies. Chair Neely stated that when this process was started, it was all about not having multiple transit organizations doing planning. She stated that the goal was to put the planning at MAG, where it should be, and not to create a regional transit authority. Mr. Smith stated that the MOU is a compromise. He noted that this is not a total consolidation of planning and that all planning is not coming to MAG.

Chair Neely commented on how she is disappointed in how this process has dragged along and hopes that we can now get board approval from the other agencies. Mayor Hallman stated that he

is still on board to regionalize the planning and operations. He noted that the issue he has been concerned about and continues to raise is that the local authorities must maintain their local control. Chair Neely agreed with Mayor Hallman. She noted that she attended the RPTA meeting and the dialog was not supportive of what was discussed in these meetings. Chair Neely noted that this is the first step to seeing regionalism in the valley. Mayor Lopez-Rogers clarified that she agrees and thinks we are all working toward the same thing, just differently.

Mr. Smith summarized what he heard today from the Committee. He stated that we will send out a notice of a telephone conference call for sometime on Friday. He also noted that we will work in the next day and a half with the other agencies to put together a consensus draft of the MOU and the legislation. If we reach consensus, we will hold the Executive Committee meeting on Friday. If consensus is not reached, we will cancel the meeting. Chair Neely requested an opportunity for the agencies to sign the agreement. Mr. Smith state that we could do that at the March meeting.

5. Development of the FY 2011 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget

Becky Kimbrough, MAG Fiscal Service Manager, reported on the MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget. Ms. Kimbrough stated that members received a revised agenda item 5D with the listing of proposed new projects for MAG for FY2011. She explained that the project list includes projects for the environmental, communications and information service divisions that have all been on the list prior to this year. She stated that the transportation projects also include projects that have been performed in past years, as well as new studies for sustainable transportation, phase II project work for framework studies, and a major investment study for the Southeast corridor. Ms. Kimbrough stated that if the Committee has any specific questions on a certain project, staff is here to address those questions.

Chair Neely asked if there were any questions. Mr. Smith stated that we are moving toward a May adoption of the budget. He noted that there is not a need for final decisions today on projects. He explained that MAG staff reviewed some of the bigger projects with member agency staff at the intergovernmental meeting, and we expect feedback in the next couple months. Eric Anderson reviewed some of the larger studies in the UPWP. Mr. Anderson stated that one of the larger projects proposed for next fiscal year is a comprehensive freight study. He noted that there is a lot of activity and interest in economic development, and interest in freight opportunities in the valley to stimulate the economy. Mr. Anderson stated that this is a \$500,000 freight framework study. The last freight study MAG did was four or five years ago where we quantified the freight flows in and out of the region. He explained that the proposed study would take it to the next level.

Mr. Anderson continued to review the studies. He noted that there are two Phase II projects currently underway, the Central Phoenix Transportation Framework Study and the Phase II Inner Loop Traffic Operations Model. Mr. Anderson stated that we have two land use oriented studies along the rail corridors. One along the BNFS corridor on Grand Avenue, and one along the Union Pacific (UP) West corridor in the southwest valley. These studies include the land use component and strategies to improve the land use planning around potential transit and commuter rail stations in the future. Mr. Anderson noted that land use, commuter rail and transit are extremely important

and this would be a precursor to getting into the FTA process to identify funding for commuter rail in the future.

Mayor Hallman asked about the West Phoenix I-10 West corridor in the commuter rail system study. He noted that it was ranked, in the commuter rail system study, the same as the Chandler industrial lead and the Tempe industrial lead, but neither the Chandler or Tempe corridors is getting any funding or further study consideration. Mayor Hallman asked staff to explain why the projects were ranked this way and how. Mr. Anderson explained that both corridors were studied and a detailed development plan was done for each corridor. He noted that a year and one half ago, we were deferring any MAG work on the southeast valley commuter rail corridor, because that is where ADOT was conducting their studies. He stated that ADOT is just now getting their Tucson/Phoenix inner city rail alternative analysis underway. Mr. Anderson stated that MAG can look at adding an east valley component. He explained that MAG had done a lot more corridor specific work in the two west valley corridors. Mayor Hallman stated that is why MAG took over what ADOT was doing because MAG had a more expedited process. He stated that it is important that the other two leads continue in the process. Mayor Hallman commented that in the end, all of the studies will comprise a regional commuter rail system for the valley. Mr. Anderson stated that the Southeast Corridor Major Investment Study is another project this is to look at the modal alternatives to serve the I-10 areas. He noted that all the modes were never studied at one time and it is certainly time to do that. Mr. Anderson suggested adding a land use component to the Southeast Corridor Major Investment Study. Mayor Hallman asked how that would be as inclusive and focused on the commuter rail piece. Mr. Anderson stated that the Phase II Central Phoenix Framework Study is a more comprehensive look at a bigger area, everything within the 101 Loop system. He explained that it is a broader perspective then the more focus study in the southeast valley. Mayor Hallman stated that adding the land use piece to the Southeast Corridor Major Investment Study seems to be the sensible thing to do. Chair Neely stated that the committee will hear this agenda item a few more time before final adoption. She stated that we should keep this moving and take a look at Mayor Hallman's comments.

Mayor Schoaf stated that he understands that El Mirage, in their latest general plan amendment, shows Grand Avenue being two lanes in each direction, as oppose to what Grand Avenue is now. He asked how the General Plan Amendment in El Mirage ties into the Grand Avenue Sustainable Transportation and Land Use Integration Study. Mr. Anderson stated that there have been staff-to-staff discussion on this issue. He explained that Grand Avenue is under the control of ADOT under the state highway system and is a major regional corridor where the region has spent a significant amount of dollars. Mr. Anderson explained that we are trying to maximize throughput on this corridor, not limit it. He noted that El Mirage wants to create some density and some livability space in that area. Mr. Anderson stated that in his opinion, making major changes in the state highway system, like El Mirage is proposing on Grand Avenue, in the general plan, is beyond the scope of that jurisdiction. Mayor Schoaf asked how MAG integrates into the studies changes in a general plans that are not likely to every happen. Mr. Anderson stated that the general plan changes and amendments have to be approved by the voters. He explained that if approved by voters, the change is reflected back into the socioeconomic and land use data basis here at MAG, which we use to generate future projections of housing, population and employment. Mr. Anderson continue to explain that if you have a general plan element that might not be realistic, it still would need to be supported by the market place. Mayor Schoaf stated that he would be

supportive of the Grand Avenue Corridor Study if the El Mirage general plan element regarding Grand Avenue is not likely to be implemented. Mayor Smith stated that it is important that we know what Grand Avenue's future is to continue with our studies. Mr. Anderson stated that in all our long range plans on the transportation side, we continue to envision Grand Avenue as a major thoroughfare.

Chair Neely suggested that maybe the study should reflect the impact of Grand Avenue not being in the study versus studying livability. Mr. Anderson stated that study can be done fairly quickly taking Grand Avenue from a major arterial to a local street and look at the impact. Chair Neely summarized that the Committee is questioning the value of the study based on the El Mirage general plan. She suggested that staff take this concern back to the local jurisdiction to justify the rationale. In addition, she asked staff to study the impact of changing Grand Avenue from a major arterial road to a local road and what that impact would have on the regional system. Mayor Cavanaugh asked if the general plans are still reviewed by the Attorney General. Fredda Bisman replied that she did not believe so, but would confirm. Mayor Cavanaugh stated that regardless of who reviews the general plans, if the changes impact state statute, then they will have a very short life. Mr. Smith indicated that all general plans and amendments come through MAG as one of the statutory provisions. Mr. Smith stated that staff will review the El Mirage general plan regarding this issue.

6. Update on the Sun Corridor

Mr. Smith stated that on December 17, 2009 the Sun Corridor Joint Planning Resolution was signed by MAG, PAG and CAAG. He noted since that time, there have been several meeting with the CANAMEX Corridor Commission and individuals representing the Yuma Port Authority. He noted that one of the discussions was regarding the UP track potentially coming through Yuma. There have been some discussions by UP that they will divert the tracks away from Yuma and into California. Mr. Smith stated that the other discussion was the track from Punta Colonet is going to stay in Mexico and then come up through either New Mexico or Texas. He also noted that there was a meeting with AECOM consulting firm and their foundation has committed to using foundation funding of \$300,000 to study three places, Dubai, Sun Corridor and a place in China. Mr Smith continued to explain that the CANAMEX Commission is finishing up their study and the Yuma Port Authority is talking about a study, and MAG has the \$500,000 freight study that Mr. Anderson mentioned in his report. Mr. Smith stated that the next step is to get together all the technicians that are working on all these studies and meet somewhere in Casa Grande to make the best out of all these studies and not duplicate any work. He noted that if it looks like we are all coming together on a focus of something that might work, we would call a meeting of the elected officials to get them on board and any comments.

Mr. Smith stated that if Punta Colonet does not happen, our freight study says that there is a tremendous amount of freight already coming through Arizona and we should be trying to get one or two percent of that into some type of an inland port. Chair Neely directed MAG staff to keep moving on this. She noted that we cannot underestimate economic development. Chair Neely asked if there were any questions. Mayor Smith asked if Guaymas ever was mentioned. Mr. Smith replied that it has been mentioned through discussions with the Arizona Mexico Commission. He noted that our freight study is far-reaching enough to look at everything. Mr. Smith also noted that

MAG staff has looked at travel time from Asia through Guaymas, through Punta Colonet, through LA Long Beach, and through Prince Rupert, and it looks like Punta Colonet has the advantage. He also stated that all of these ports have a role to play.

Chair Neely asked if there were any other questions. She noted that there were no other questions and state that the Committee looks forward to another report soon.

7. 2010 Desert Peaks Awards Update

Kelly Taft, Communications Manager, provided an update on the Desert Peaks Awards. Ms. Taft stated that MAG is currently accepting nominations and the deadline for entry is Friday, March 12, 2010. She noted that nomination packets were not sent out this year in an effort to save costs, but all materials are posted on the MAG website. She also stated that there are copies of the nominations packets at the table if any member would like to take one.

Ms. Taft commented that an important element of this event will be judging the nominations. As in the past years, we are requesting assistance from our Regional Council member in providing suggestions of qualified individuals to serve as potential judges on this important panel. Ms. Taft stated that this was announced at past Regional Council meetings and was followed up with a formal letter of request. Ms. Taft stated that MAG works hard each year to develop a balanced slate of judges. The panel typically includes about 5 to 7 members. She explained that the judging panels have consisted of members representing the state legislature, businesses, universities, and local governments, as well as former Desert Peaks Award winners. Ms. Taft commented that the experience and backgrounds of those serving on this prestigious panel is critical to ensuring that selections are based on a true understanding of issues and the concept of regionalism. She explained that these recommendations are due to staff by next week, February 24, 2010.

Ms. Taft stated that the Desert Peaks Awards program will be held on June 30, 2010 this year, following the annual MAG Regional Council meeting. She noted that there is no fee for submitting nominations and the event is free to attend. Ms. Taft explained that we are once again hoping to significantly defray the cost of hosting the event through sponsorships. Last year we secured about \$18,500 in sponsorships. She explained that we have sent out a sponsorship request letter to more than 100 agencies and businesses, and we will be following up with personal phone calls soon. Staff has also been exploring some potential venues and costs. Ms. Taft introduced Sarah Daily, Office Services Manager, to provide some additional information regarding this effort.

Sarah Daily explained that in 2008, the Desert Peaks Awards event was held at the Arizona Biltmore. The Arizona Biltmore offered many conveniences, such as location and a beautiful space. She noted the evaluation feedback suggested that the room was very warm and the food portions were very small. Ms. Daily further explained that this year, MAG staff has analyzed six potential local venues, including the Arizona Biltmore, which can accommodate up to 300 people and are available on June 30, 2010 for the awards ceremony. She stated that the set-up would be similar to the previous Desert Peaks event in that we would have an appetizer buffet set-up and hosted bar with drink ticket available for each attendee.

Ms. Daily noted some of the key points of each venue. The Wyndham, Hyatt Regency, and Sheraton are centrally located and they have prepared pretty reasonable proposals. However, all of these locations will charge parking fees for each vehicle entering their parking garage. She stated that this fee will range from \$5 to \$12 depending on the location.

Ms. Daily continued with the Crowne Plaza Phoenix Airport facility, which is conveniently located off one of the light rail stops. If this venue is selected, they have offered us a 10 percent discount on food and beverage and a gift certificate for a weekend stay to give as a raffle prize. She then stated that the Pointe Hilton Tapatio Cliffs and the Arizona Biltmore are the most expensive, which means that you are paying for the added comforts and conveniences you get with a high end resort. Ms. Daily concluded her report and asked if there were any questions or advise on moving forward in selecting a venue for the 2010 Desert Peaks Awards.

Councilmember Neely stated that the cost associated with this event is very important. She noted that it is important to show the community that we are spending money wisely. She also noted that it is important to have the light rail access. Mayor Hallman agreed with Councilmember Neely. He added that the Desert Peaks event is a great regional event. Mayor Hallman stated that he believes that this event should continue to be a reception function to help keep costs in line. Mr. Smith confirmed that these prices are reflective of a reception. Councilmember Neely stated that staff should move forward with the planning process and keep in mind that we need to be cognizant of the economic times.

8. Request for Future Agenda Items

Chair Neely asked if there were any requests for future agenda items. There were none.

Mr. Smith introduced Patty Comacho, the new Senior Policy Planner, and welcomed back Denise McClafferty, Management Analyst III.

9. Adjournment

Mayor Hallman moved to adjourn the Executive Committee meeting. Councilmember Neely seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. There being no further business, the Executive Committee adjourned at 1:17 p.m.

Chair

Secretary